

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of October 16, 2006 is respectfully requested.

It is initially noted that a number of minor editorial changes have been made to the specification in the above. Such changes are for the sake of form and for literal support for the claim language as now presented. No new matter is presented.

The Examiner noted that Applicant was non-responsive in failing to identify the claims readable upon the elected species. Applicants' undersigned representative apologizes for this oversight, and agrees with the indication that claims 1 and 2 are readable upon the elected species.

At this point, all of the prior claims have been canceled; claims 1-3 have been replaced with new claims 8-11. Claims 8 and 10 read upon the elected species. Claims 9 and 11 do not read upon the elected species. Claims 10 and 11 correspond to claims 8 and 9, but have been drafted to have a slightly different scope. Thus, at this point both claims 8 and 10 are independent claims directed to the elected embodiment.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art. Each of claims 8 and 10, however, recite that a disc-transfer roll has the inner cylindrical wall, the annular joint and the outer cylindrical wall together forming one single piece made of an elastic material. This is not the case with the prior art in Figs. 11(a) and 11(b). As can be seen from Figs. 10, the so-called inner and outer cylindrical walls are separate pieces.

Claims 8 and 10 also both recite an annular opening communicating with the space between the outer and inner cylindrical walls. Note the position of reference number 1a in Fig. 2a, for example. Such a feature is also not found in the recited prior art.

The above aspects clearly define over the admitted prior art. For these reasons, claims 8 and 10 should now clearly be in condition for allowance. Claims 9 and 11, being dependent from claims 8 and 10, should also be in condition for allowance for the same reason. Indication of such is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is requested to pass the case to issue. If the

Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Taizo MINOWA et al.

By: _____



Nils E. Pedersen

Registration No. 33,145

Attorney for Applicants

NEP/krp
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 17, 2007